



OSL Research Day 2018 – Afternoon Sessions

Session 1 ‘Literature and Law’

Time: 14:00-15:30

Location: Jantina Tammeszaal, University Library, Broerstraat, 4th floor

Convenors: Dr. Alberto Godioli (a.godioli@rug.nl) Dr. Florian Lippert (f.j.lippert@rug.nl) and Prof. dr Sebastian Sobacki

A. Presentations (10 min each)

- 1) Yuliia Khyzhniak and Kostiantyn Gorobets, RUG: 'Resistance to the Past: Author and Authority in International Law'
- 2) Dr Marielle Matthee, Leiden University Centre for Linguistics: 'The Bakhtinian Dialogue and Its Relevance for the Field of Law'
- 3) Prof. Dr. Frans Willem Korsten, Leiden University: 'What lies beyond Critical Legal Studies: The Humanities and Issues of *Jurisgenesis*'
- 4) Dr Ted Laros, Open Universiteit Amsterdam: 'Law and literature as a (cultural) sociological research domain'

B. Discussion on presentations, ongoing research, and current state of Law and Literature studies. For this part of the session, we would like to use the Introduction the book *New Directions in Law and Literature*, eds. E.S. Anker and B. Meyler (please see attachment).

*

Session 2 ‘Tourism and Travel Cultures’

Time: 14:00-15:30

Location: Annie Nicolette Josephus Jittazaal (room 0339, University Library, Broerstraat 4, 3rd floor)

Convenor: Dr. Sjoerd-Jeroen Moenandar (s.j.moenandar@rug.nl)

This session is planned as a roundtable discussion preceded by several presentations on companionship in travel writing.

Presentations:

- Tom Sintobin (Radboud University): “My ladies and my luggage were unloaded” Cyriel Buysse on the road with three women’
- Babs Boter (Vrije Universiteit): ‘The Not So Solo Traveler: Mary Pos, Dutch Writer and Journalist’
- Alan Moss (Radboud Universiteit): ‘Female Passengers and Female Voices in Early Modern Dutch Travelogues of Leisure Trips’

*

Session 3 ‘Poetics of Knowledge: Patterns and Interpretation’

Time: 14:00-15:30

Location: Room OBS 23.014 (Oude Boteringestraat 23, ground floor), Groningen

Convenors: Dr. Marieke Winkler (Marieke.Winkler@ou.nl); Dr. Stephan Besser (s.besser@uva.nl)

This session is organized by the OSL research group Poetics of Knowledge and planned as a discussion of the relation of patterns and interpretation in literary studies, based on Franco Moretti’s essay of the same title (2017). We start with brief presentations (10 min.) by four speakers and then open the floor for discussion (chair: prof. Pablo Valdivia).

Lucas van der Deijl (UvA)

How to code the ‘already said’ (and why)?

The polemical debate about quantitative methodology in literary studies has been stuck in a discourse of opposition. Due to their provocative rhetoric, scholars such as Moretti and Jockers are often read as if ‘distant’ should replace ‘close’ in the age of pattern recognition and after ‘the end of meaning’. On the other hand, not many of their critics proved much interested in finding a middle road either. As a cultural and literary historian whose questions in some cases require quantitative methods, I often fail to side with the positions in this debate. In this presentation I will briefly illustrate my experiences with the middle road I call ‘computer-assisted discourse analysis’. Through

an example taken from my own research, I will provide two points for further discussion concerning (1) the conceptual need for quantitative analysis implied in the notion of 'discourse' and (2) the risks involved in the study of literature through an intermediary, formalised language (code), inspired by the work of Michel Foucault and N. Katherine Hayles respectively.

Mathijs Sanders (RUG)

Pattern Recognition and Reader Response Criticism in the Digital Age

As a literary scholar interested in reception theory and in various 'uses' of literature (cf. Felski), I would like to explore and discuss the consequences of Franco Moretti's argument in favour of quantitative analysis, distant reading and pattern recognition for the study of reader's responses to literary texts. The ever increasing availability of reception data (think of digitized newspapers and magazines, but also results of large-scale surveys among readers) raises critical questions about the future of reader response criticism in a digital age.

Birgit M. Kaiser (UU)

Patterns matter & matter reads

"Instead of reading, pattern recognition." (Moretti, 'Patterns and Interpretation,' 4) So as to be able to "explain[..] why patterns are there" (5). From a materialist and feminist perspective, the epistemological aim of recognition and the ontological claim of a "being there" of patterns that Moretti puts forward warrants examination. Who recognizes and what is allegedly given? Drawing on research in feminist science studies, we might find that the value of patterns lies elsewhere than in mastering the alleged chaos of the archive (whose archive?). From Barad's "agential realist" perspective, for instance, "human subjects are neither outside observers of apparatuses, nor independent subjects that intervene in the workings of an apparatus, nor the products of social technologies that produce them. [...Rather, the] point is as follows: to the extent that concepts, laboratory manipulations, observational interventions, and other human practices have a role to play, it is as part of the larger material configuration of the world" (*Meeting*, 171) Patterns and especially diffraction patterns are "patterns of difference that make a difference" (Barad, 72). What might that mean for literary reading today? Even in digitalized times, Nietzsche's project of an active philology still seems worthy our attention; a philology, as Deleuze reads Nietzsche, that "looks to discover who it is that speaks and names. 'Who uses a particular word, what does he apply it to first of all [...] and with what intention? What does he will by uttering a particular word?' The transformation of the sense of a word means that someone else (another force and another will) has taken possession of it and is applying it to another thing because he wants something else. (*Nietzsche and Philosophy*, 74-75).

Stephan Besser (UvA)

Continuity and Collision: The Promise of 'Patterns' in the Human Sciences

“Great keyword of our times, pattern.” Franco Moretti’s remark in his recent essay ‘Patterns and Interpretation’ (2017) sounds quite convincing: from pattern recognition software to ‘nonconscious cognition’ (K. Hayles), from predictive processing approaches in neuroscience to big data in the humanities, ‘our age’ indeed seems indeed seems to be an age of patterns. But what are the epistemic and political implications of the current discourse (dispositive, episteme...?) of ‘patterns’ in the human sciences? In my contribution I will reflect on some aspects of the current fascination with patterns in cognitive science and literature studies by looking at recent work by philosopher and cognitive scientist Andy Clark (*Surfing Uncertainty*, 2016) and literary scholar Caroline Levine (*Forms*, 2015). The promise of patterns might be their alleged and versatile ubiquity in times of open and flat ontologies (*pace* Moretti).

*

Session 4 ‘Transgressing Borders: Mediating & Negotiating Cultures’

Time: 16:00-17:30

Location: Jantina Tammeszaal

Convenors: Dr Petra Broomans p.broomans@rug.nl, Prof. dr Mathijs Sanders m.p.j.sanders@rug.nl, Dr Jeanette den Toonder j.m.l.den.toonder@rug.nl.

The field of cultural transfer studies is a relatively young discipline which developed against the backdrop of important events and “turns”, such as the crisis in literary historiography and the “personal” turn in translation studies at the end of the twentieth century. In thinking about cultural transfer the need for a history of cultural transfer studies (CTStory) is required, a rethinking of concepts as well as methodological frameworks including tools and instruments such as translators’ dictionaries and translation bibliographies. Furthermore, describing the cultural transmitters’ lives and works requires a meta literary historical awareness.

Unsuccessful cultural transfer processes and the lack of material complicate the writing of a cultural transfer history. To date, in addition to this complexity, the histories of cultural transfer have commonly relied on metaphors of trade and conquest when describing the literary field in which translators and translations take a visible or invisible position. In this regard, the historiographer will also have to decide on characterization of the cultural transmitter: will it be one in which the protagonist is a leader and discoverer, or the silent worker and clerk? Discourse analysis could be one of the methods to be used in this field. Other useful methods are network analysis and sociology of literature to investigate the context of the cultural transmitter.

Cultural transmitters took often a marginal position within literary history, not only in national literary histories, but also in the history of world literature. Within the field of world literature, scholars have criticized the centre-peripheral paradox: Paris as cultural capital (Casanova); is only literature written in or translated into English considered world literature? (Moretti, Damrosch), does world literature exist? (according to Apter it does not because of the untranslatable) etc. Related to these issues is the question how minority literature will survive the global tsunami. Is translating minority literature an act of crossing borders? Which negotiations are necessary in order for a publishing house to publish a book of a minority writer? Is migrant literature building bridges between the migrant and the new culture? How many compromises do the migrant writer and/or his/her translator need to enter the new literary field?

In this session we want to focus on topics such as:

- concepts in the study of cultural transfer
- methods
- (digital) tools
- cultural transfer history
- cultural transmitters and world literature
- minority/migrant literature and cultural transfer
- gender and cultural transfer

The session will include a discussion about a short text, “Cultural mobility. A manifesto” (2009) by Stephen Greenblatt, provided by the organizers in advance.

*

Session 5 ‘Arts and the Public Sphere’

Time: 16:00-17:30

Location: Zernikezaal, Academy Building (Broerstraat 5, main building opposite the library, 3rd floor)

Convenors: Jesse van Amelsvoort (j.d.van.amelsvoort@rug.nl), Prof. dr Laura Bieger, Dr. Thijs Lijster, Prof. dr Margriet van der Waal

In this session, we look at the ways in which literature and the arts contribute to, engage with or are interrelated with the public sphere. In Jürgen Habermas’s famous formulation, the liberal bourgeois public sphere was constituted in part by salons and coffee houses where learned men debated matters of the common good with each other. Moreover, public deliberation happens through newspapers, television programmes and other news media.

We want to understand media as broader than news only, to include other carriers of information, too. Novels, plays, films and other art installations intervene in their own way in public discussions: they might constitute a new public or address an existing public in a new way, tell stories that illuminate political discussions or create a social awareness. Guiding questions in the session are:

- What is the relevance of ‘the public’ and ‘the public sphere’?
- What role does the public sphere play in our work?
- How does art intersect with the public sphere?

Set up

The session will start with short (5 min.) presentations based on position papers that answer the abovementioned questions. After these presentations we will continue with a general discussion with all participants on the issues raised.

Confirmed speakers include:

- Jesse van Amelsvoort, MA (RUG, Campus Fryslân)
- prof. dr. Laura Bieger (RUG, American Studies)
- dr. Quirijn van den Hoogen (RUG, Arts, Culture, Media)
- dr. Corina Koolen (Huygens Institute, Literary Studies)
- dr. Thijs Lijster (RUG, Arts, Culture, Media)
- prof. dr. Margriet van der Waal (RUG, Euroculture; UvA, South African Studies)

*

Session 6 ‘Memory and Resistance in Times of Crisis’

Time: 16:00-17:30

Location: Room A.02, Academy Building (Broerstraat 5, main building opposite the library, ground floor)

Convenors: Dr Ksenia Robbe (k.robbe@hum.leidenuniv.nl), Prof. dr Maria Boletsi, Dr. Kasia Mika

In this panel, we seek to explore and bring together questions of crisis, memory and resistance, as experienced, imagined and formulated across a range of global contexts. Without assuming easy, totalizing comparisons or simplistic points of connection, we want to consider the ways in which crisis/crises—be they economic, environmental, social, political or combination of these - trigger memories of earlier practices of resistance in devising new ways of contesting power. How is the past represented and retold in times of crisis? In what ways are past crises taken up and made present again in practices of resistance and opposition, and to what effects? What perceptions of history and experiences of temporality, and what visions of the future emerge out of crisis-events and times of crisis?

Crisis has an intimate relation with *time*: according to Reinhart Koselleck, since the mid 18th century, crisis defines (Western) modernity and becomes the main concept for conceptualizing history itself. Historically, the term *crisis* assumes diverse and often

contradictory meanings: it can denote choice, decision, judgment or critique; it can signal a turning point in history or a moment of truth, but also a chronic state without immediate prospect of resolution. In addition, discursive uses and affective perceptions of 'crisis' can involve a sense of halt, disconnection and disorientation as they "collapse time, and in so doing fracture linear temporality" (Larkan and Murphy 2018). These moments, however, can provoke questioning received notions of the past and re-imagining (past) futures, and even initiate new conceptions of history.

At the same time, crisis is often used as an immobilising characterisation of regions deemed to be in a permanent state of crisis. This focus on crisis/crises is attentive to and builds on the ways in which 'the notion of crisis has been a tempting, if problematic, lens through which to understand today's historically rooted forms of precarity and reactionary politics of othering' (Biehl and Locke 2017). Away from totalizing accounts of a joint and shared descent into seemingly unending crisis-times, the workshop aims to stress the uneven distribution, experience and reality of crisis; a threatening future to come for some (for example of accelerated climate change,) and a well-established lived present for many. Crisis, then, is also the ordinary, wounding structure; a continuity rather than a rupture. Yet both can trigger and motivate resistance, opposition and a radical rethinking of the here and now and the future to come.

Practices of *memory and resistance*, in this regard, play a key role in experiencing and dealing with crises. Overall, searching for models and guidance in the past - the practice of 'temporal anchoring' (Huysen 1995) - is symptomatic of our times of rapid globalization and the general transformation of temporal and spatial coordinates it brings about. Each situation and node of crisis, however, requires context-specific consideration. Just like states and senses of 'crisis', meanings and acts of 'memory' are inherently ambiguous, selective and politicized. In situations of crisis, past events are often re-enacted and invested with new urgency; traumas can re-emerge in the public sphere; modes of emplotting past, present and future can be radically altered. In some cases, invocations of the past can be used to legitimize austerity measures, nationalist revivals and ethnocentric claims at times of crisis. Other examples reveal that these situations can spark engagement with neglected traditions of interculturality, protest and recovery.

We would like to consider a variety of such responses to crisis, involving overlapping, intersecting, conflicting as well as multidirectional practices (Rothberg 2009) of memory and resistance. In studying these varied practices, the question of how memory is used to generate and rethink resistance is central for our inquiry. We invite contributions, from across literary, cultural studies, anthropology, philosophy, memory and future studies, among others, as well as creative artistic interventions that explore these interwoven questions of crisis/crises, memories, resistance and future.

Set up

The Memory & Resistance panel is planned more of a brainstorming than a conference session, in order to elaborate ideas at the nexus of the three notions in the title and to plan a workshop for next year, and possibly other follow-up events. The idea is to set up a research group/community of colleagues who are interested in the topic and in

coming together for theoretical discussions and other projects (workshops, publications, etc.) So new members from a variety of fields are very much welcome. We'll start with short input papers by Maria Boletsi, Kasia Mika and Ksenia Robbe and then open the floor for discussion.